

COMPUTATION OF COEFFICIENT FUNCTIONS FOR AN EXPANSION
OF PARAPOSITRONIUM DECAY WIDTH USING REDUCE *

A.A.PIVOVAROV

*Institute for Nuclear Research
Moscow, 117312, Russia[†]*

A kind of asymptotic expansion for calculation of the (para)positronium decay rate is formulated. The method is completely relativistic and gauge invariant. The expansion goes over the inverse square of relative momentum k of two photons in Euclidean region and the actual width is determined at $k^2 = -m^2$, m being the electron mass.

* Talk presented at Fourth AIHENP95 Workshop, Pisa, Italy, 3-8 April 1995

[†]E-mail: aapiv@ms2.inr.ac.ru

At present, computation of physical observables with high precision is of great importance for testing theory. In some cases the accuracy of experimental data is better than theoretical predictions that requires further calculations for adequate comparison. The standard perturbation theory can then become fairly difficult to live with. Thus, the most recent data on lifetime of (ortho)positronium^{1,2} seem to contradict the present theoretical calculations^{3–5} done in the next-to-leading order in fine structure constant α . Full two-loop calculations are not available yet and the discrepancy is often parametrized by the value of second order coefficient (a factor in front of $(\alpha/\pi)^2$) that should be about 250 (e.g.⁶). This number is considered quite big though not inconceivable especially bearing in mind the large first coefficient. Despite all speculations one cannot claim the real inconsistency till the reliable computation of the second order coefficient and confirmation of experimental measurements. Recently another special set of diagrams has been analytically computed in⁶. New formulation based on explicit use of nonrelativistic effective theory has been also implemented for getting a representation that stresses the splitting of momentum region into relativistic and nonrelativistic parts^{7,8}. Along with these efforts to have new additional terms computed there are more formal attempts to resum the known series using different kinds of summation technique, for instance, Padé approximation. Indeed, rewriting the series in equivalent form up to relative order α one can make the required higher order coefficients essentially smaller⁹. A remark is in order here. Strictly speaking the rate should not be represented as a power series in α – even some analytical functions of α connected with exact treatment of an initial approximation can be kept in their concise form. This will not mean any violation of consistency because α is not an expansion parameter.¹⁰ For fitting experiment, it implies that the change of zero order approximation in Bethe-Salpeter approach could bring new terms of any order in α that can stand on the legal ground. Still, it is difficult to understand the required large value of the second order coefficient. The technique based on the Bethe-Salpeter equation was widely used for computation of quarkonium decay rates^{11,12} where a new nonrelativistic theory based approach has been recently developed as well.^{8,13}

The present note describes a technique of calculating the parapositronium decay rate into photons that is inspired by methods of physics of strong interaction.¹⁴ Results of explicit calculation of parapositronium width up to the first order in the fine structure constant are reported.¹⁵

The Lehmann-Symanzik-Zimmermann reduction¹⁶ leads to the following expression for the two-photon decay rate of positronium

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \gamma(k_1) \gamma(k_2) | P(p) \rangle &= i(2\pi)^4 \delta(p - k_1 - k_2) e^2 \epsilon^\mu(k_1) \epsilon^\nu(k_2) \langle 0 | \Pi_{\mu\nu}(k) | P(p) \rangle, \\ T_{\mu\nu}(x) &= iT J_\mu(x/2) J_\nu(-x/2), \quad T_{\mu\nu}(k) = i \int T J_\mu(x/2) J_\nu(-x/2) e^{ikx} dx \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $|P(p)\rangle$ is an approximation for the positronium bound state, $p^2 = m_P^2$, $k = (k_1 - k_2)/2$, J_μ is the fermion electromagnetic current, $\epsilon^\mu(k_1)$ is a polarization vector of a photon. Because of momentum conservation, $p = k_1 + k_2$, and mass-

shell conditions for the photons, $k_1^2 = k_2^2 = 0$, there exist kinematical constraints on the variables k and p , $kp = 0$ and $k^2 = -m_P^2/4$, m_P being the "positronium" mass.

The main thing to analyze is therefore a T -product of two electromagnetic currents $T_{\mu\nu}(k)$ that, being sandwiched between the vacuum and positronium state, gives a matrix element of the decay process

$$\langle 0 | T_{\mu\nu}(k) | P(p) \rangle = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} k^\alpha p^\beta F(k^2), \quad \Gamma(P \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = |F(-\frac{m_P^2}{4})|^2 \frac{e^4 m_P^3}{64\pi}. \quad (2)$$

Little can be said about the vector $|P(p)\rangle$ besides that its quantum numbers are $J^{PC} = 0^{-+}$. It is quite analogous to the neutral pion state in QCD. To the leading order in α Eq. (2) gives its decay width but corrections cannot be unambiguously computed unless the electromagnetic contribution to the pion wave function itself is properly taken into account. As for the T -product of currents, it can be expanded in x when x goes to zero.¹⁷ For the matrix element, Eq. (1), this expansion turns into a series in the ratio of two scales connected with soft and hard parts of the process respectively. The first one is the Bohr radius of the positronium ground state $r_B \sim 1/\alpha m$ that determines an effective size of the bound state wave function and the second is the cutoff length set by the fermion mass m , $r_{cut} \sim 1/m$. Eventually, it is an expansion in r_{cut}/r_B , or in α , but not completely since each term can contain some higher powers of α as well. The decay rate given by the form factor $F(k^2)$ will be parametrized with some numbers that describe the inner structure of positronium and can not be found without analyzing its dynamics as a bound state.

To obtain the decay rate one needs the form factor $F(k^2)$ only at the physical point $k^2 = -m_P^2/4$. The asymptotic expansion of the T -product can be done for any value of k^2 in Euclidean region $k^2 < 0$ because one does not encounter any physical singularities. Fortunately, the physical point belongs to the allowed region and one can compute the form factor at the desired point $k^2 = -m_P^2/4$. The convergence of the expansion, which is asymptotic one, at this particular point is not guaranteed.

Generating formula for the expansion reads

$$T_{\mu\nu}(x) = \bar{\psi}(x/2) \gamma_\mu G(x) \gamma_\nu \psi(-x/2) + \bar{\psi}(-x/2) \gamma_\nu G(-x) \gamma_\mu \psi(x/2) + \dots \quad (3)$$

where $G(x)$ stands for a full fermion propagator. Since one needs only operators with parapositronium quantum numbers the T -product can be antisymmetrized with respect to indices μ and ν (see Eq. (2)). This is implicitly implied in the following.

The leading term has the form

$$T_{\mu\nu}^0(k) = \frac{2i\epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} k^\alpha \bar{\psi} \gamma^\beta \gamma_5 \psi}{m^2 - k^2} \quad (4)$$

and gives the contribution to the form factor $F(k^2)$

$$F^0(k^2) = -\frac{2}{m^2 + \kappa^2} f_P, \quad (5)$$

where f_P is defined by the relation $\langle 0 | \bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 \psi | P(p) \rangle = i p^\mu f_P$, and a notation $\kappa^2 = -k^2 = m_P^2/4$ is used. Clearly, this quantity is similar to the pion decay constant. After inserting a correction to the fermion propagator

$$\Delta G(k) = \frac{e \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} k^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma_5}{(m^2 - k^2)^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{e m \sigma^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}}{(m^2 - k^2)^2}, \quad \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F^{\alpha\beta}, \quad \sigma^{\mu\nu} = \frac{i}{2} [\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu]$$

into Eq. (3) and set arguments of fermion fields equal to zero the following result for a dimension-five operator connected with a photon emission follows

$$T_{\mu\nu}^F(k) = \frac{2i \epsilon_{\mu\tau\nu\lambda} k_\rho e \bar{\psi} \tilde{F}_{\rho\tau} \gamma^\lambda \psi}{(m^2 + \kappa^2)^2}.$$

Defining the δ^2 parameter by the relation

$$\langle 0 | e \bar{\psi} \tilde{F}^{\rho\tau} \gamma^\lambda \psi | P(p) \rangle = (p^\rho g^{\tau\lambda} - p^\tau g^{\rho\lambda}) i f_P \delta^2 / 3$$

one finds

$$F^F(k^2) = \frac{2}{3} \frac{f_P \delta^2}{(m^2 + \kappa^2)^2}.$$

The quantity δ^2 is obviously of order α at least.

Next terms of the series are given by derivatives of fermion fields after substitution of a free propagator $S(x)$ for the full one $G(x)$. The first-order derivative gives a contribution

$$T_{\mu\nu}^1(k) = \frac{2m k^\alpha \bar{\psi} \sigma^{\mu\nu} \overleftrightarrow{D}_\alpha \psi}{(m^2 + \kappa^2)^2}$$

that turns into

$$F^1(k^2) = \frac{f_P}{3} \frac{4m^2 - m_P^2}{(m^2 + \kappa^2)^2}$$

after averaging between the vacuum and positronium states. This term is also suppressed by α due to presence of the difference $4m^2 - m_P^2$.

The second-order derivative leads to an operator $\bar{\psi} \gamma^\lambda \gamma_5 \overleftrightarrow{D}_\alpha \overleftrightarrow{D}_\beta \psi$, the matrix element of which can be expressed through three numbers A, B, C

$$\langle 0 | \bar{\psi} \overleftrightarrow{D}^{\alpha\beta} \gamma^\lambda \gamma_5 \psi | P(p) \rangle = i f_P A g^{\alpha\beta} p^\lambda + B (g^{\alpha\lambda} p^\beta + g^{\beta\lambda} p^\alpha) + C p^\alpha p^\beta p^\lambda$$

though only one of them contributes

$$F^2(k^2) = \frac{f_P A}{(m^2 + \kappa^2)^2} \frac{3m^2 + \kappa^2}{m^2 + \kappa^2}.$$

I failed to show in general that the quantity A is of the order α in comparison with the leading term, Eq. (5).

The final representation up to dimension-five operators reads

$$F(k^2) = -\frac{2f_P}{m^2 + \kappa^2} \left(1 - \frac{\delta^2}{3(m^2 + \kappa^2)} - \frac{4m^2 - m_P^2}{6(m^2 + \kappa^2)} - \frac{A}{2(m^2 + \kappa^2)} \frac{3m^2 + \kappa^2}{m^2 + \kappa^2} \right). \quad (6)$$

For a consistent analysis perturbative corrections to the coefficient function of the leading operator, Eq. (4), have to be found. Being written in the form

$$T_{\mu\nu}^0(k) = \frac{2i\epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}k^\alpha\bar{\psi}\gamma^\beta\gamma_5\psi}{m^2 - k^2}\left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{4\pi}c(z)\right), \quad (7)$$

they are

$$\begin{aligned} c(z) = & \frac{c_1}{3}(-z^2 + 10z + 2 + \frac{12}{z+1} + \frac{3}{z}) + \frac{c_2}{3}(z^2 - 7z - 32 + \frac{12}{z}) \\ & + \frac{1}{3}(-2z^2 + 19z - \frac{11}{2} + \frac{24}{z+1} + \frac{3}{z}) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $z = \kappa^2/m^2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= \int_0^1 dx \ln(zx(1-x) + x) = \frac{(z+1)\ln(z+1)}{z} - 2, \\ c_2 &= \frac{z}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{zx(1-x) + 1} = \frac{1}{a} \ln \frac{a+1}{a-1}, \quad a = \sqrt{1+4/z}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The electron mass is the pole mass. The actual calculation was performed in the $\overline{MS}$ -scheme of renormalization with its natural mass parameter $m_{\overline{MS}}$. A relation between these two up to one-loop order is¹⁸

$$m = m_{\overline{MS}} \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{\pi} \left(3 \ln \frac{\mu^2}{m_{\overline{MS}}^2} + 1 \right) \right).$$

The quantity $c(z)$ does not depend on the renormalization scheme if the physical pole mass is used. The program of symbolic manipulations REDUCE has been heavily used for computation.

To verify Eq. (8) one can investigate two simple limits. First, $z \rightarrow \infty$ that corresponds to $m \rightarrow 0$ or $\kappa^2 \rightarrow \infty$ at fixed m . In this limit the logarithmic z -dependence of function $c(z)$ must completely drop out because of the zero anomalous dimension of the coefficient function. The result is $c(\infty) = -7$. This result has been also checked by independent calculation with taking the massless limit from the very beginning. Though contributions of different diagrams have been considerably rearranged a full agreement for the final answer was found. The opposite limit $z \rightarrow 0$ also must not reveal any singularity. It is easy to see that Eq. (8) is valid, $c(0) = 7/2$.

Neglecting the difference between $4m^2$ and m_P^2 , which is of order α^2 , one gets

$$1 + \frac{\alpha}{4\pi}c(1) = 1 + 1.012 \frac{\alpha}{4\pi}.$$

Now we briefly consider parameters of Eq. (6). The amplitude f_P is connected with that of the positronium wave function at the origin¹⁹. The δ^2 parameter is reduced to the matrix element $\langle 0 | e\bar{\psi}\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}\gamma^\nu\psi | P(p) \rangle = ip_\mu f_P \delta^2$ that is closely related

to the corresponding δ^2 parameter in strong interaction²⁰. As for the A parameter, I did not succeed in expressing it in any transparent manner. Both δ^2 and A parameters related to the positronium wave functions of nonleading twists.

Eq. (6) represents the main result. One sees that the two-photon decay width of parapositronium is expressed through three parameters f_P , δ^2 and A that require a special model to determine them. Unambiguous physical meaning (up to a corresponding α order within perturbative QED) can be given to physical quantities that do not contain these parameters. They could be computed independently if one knows the positronium wave function from other sources (for instance, lattice calculation). The main problem how to define properly the vector $|P(p)\rangle$ cannot be answered within the approach; so, strictly speaking, the model dependent calculation of the parameters f_P , δ^2 and A are ambiguous in higher orders in α though the parametrization (6) itself is not. Another advantage of the proposed approach is a possibility to sum up many corrections with the help of a nonlocal operator expansion.^{21–23}

Acknowledgements

Discussions with A.A.Penin are acknowledged. I thank the organizers of AIHENP95 Workshop for warm and creative atmosphere. The work is supported in part by Russian Fund for Fundamental Research under Grants Nos 93-02-14428 and 94-02-06427 and by Soros Foundation.

References

1. C.I.Westbrook, D.W.Gidley, R.S.Conti, and A.Rich, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 1328 (1987), E *ibid.* 2153; *Phys. Rev.* **A40**, 5489 (1989).
2. J.S.Nico, D.W.Gidley, A.Rich, and P.W.Zitzewitz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1344 (1990).
3. M.A.Stroschio and J.M.Holt, *Phys. Rev.* **A10**, 749 (1974).
4. W.E.Caswell and G.P.Lepage, *Phys. Rev.* **A20**, 36 (1979).
5. G.S.Adkins, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **146**, 78 (1983).
6. G.S.Adkins and M.Lymeropoulos, *Phys.Rev.* **A51**, (1995).
7. P.Labelle, G.P.Lepage, and U.Magnea, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **72**, 2006 (1994).
8. W.E.Caswell and G.P.Lepage, *Phys. Lett.* **167B**, 437 (1986).
9. M.A.Samuel and G.Li *Phys. Lett.* **B331**, 114 (1994).
10. R.Barbieri and E.Remiddi, *Nucl. Phys.* **B141**, 413 (1978).
11. R.Barbieri, E.d'Emilio, E.Curci and E.Remiddi, *Nucl. Phys.* **B154**, 535 (1979).
12. G.P.Lepage and P.Mackenzie, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **47**, 1244 (1981).
13. E.Braaten, *NUHEP-TH-94-22*, Sep 1994.
14. A.H.Mueller, ed. *Perturbative quantum chromodynamics*, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989).
15. A.A.Pivovarov, *Phys. Rev.* **D47**, 5183 (1993).
16. H.Lehman, K.Symanzik, and W.Zimmermann, *Nuovo Cim.* **1**, 1425 (1955); **6**, 319 (1957).
17. K.G.Wilson, *Phys. Rev.* **179**, 1499 (1969).

18. S.Narison, *Phys. Lett.* **B197**, 405 (1987).
19. R. van Royen, V.F. Weisskopf, *Nucl. Phys.* **B50**, 617,(1967);
T.Appelquist and H.D.Politzer, *Phys. Rev.* **D12**, 1404 (1975).
20. V.A.Novikov et al., *Nucl. Phys.* **B237**, 525 (1984);
A.A.Ovchinnikov and A.A.Pivovarov, *Yad. Fiz.* **48**, 1135 (1988).
21. A.V.Radyushkin, S.V.Mikhailov, *ZhETP Lett.* **43**,551 (1986).
22. I.I.Balitsky and V.M.Braun, *Nucl. Phys.* **B361**, 93 (1991).
23. A.A.Pivovarov, *Phys. Lett.* **B236**, 214 (1990), *ibid* **B255**, 117 (1991).